UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/750,276	12/29/2000	Justin E. Pedro	05288.00003	6489

22907   7590   10/04/2007
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
1100 13th STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/750,276	Applicant(s) PEDRO, JUSTIN E.
	Examiner Maikhanh Nguyen	Art Unit 2176

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 July 2007*.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1,2 and 9-16* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) *1,2 and 9-16* is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the RCE filed 07/11/2007.

Claims 1-2 and 9-16 are presenting for examination. Claims 1, 9, and 12 have been

amended. Claims 1, 9, and 12 are independent claims.

Request Continuation for Examination

2.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in

37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application

is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37

CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been

withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 07/11/2007 has

been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 9-11 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The phrase "*a browser program*" (claim 9, line 6) renders the claim indefinite. It is unclear if it is referring to "a browser program" recited at line 4.

Dependent claims 10-11 and 16 are rejected for fully incorporating the deficiencies of their base claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section

351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international
application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Minard** (U.S.

6247020, filed 12/1997).

As to claim 1:

Minard teaches a computer with a display projecting a graphical user interface to a user

(e.g., AppBrowser 400 presents the document ... a standard browser context interface;

col. 8, lines 1-62), said graphical user interface displaying form content *(e.g., a Java file*

...the source code for the file is displayed) and HTML content in a common window

(e.g., the Content pane are HTML) [col. 9, line 63-col.10, line 15],

wherein said form content and said HTML content are rendered and controlled by a Java

and displayed in a Java applet execution in a browser in the common window, the applet

execution providing browsing capabilities to a user based on user interaction *(e.g., if the*

user selects an HTML file in the Navigation pane ... the user see the rendered HTML

file ... in a web browser ... if the user selects the Doc tab when viewing a .java file, the

system will the display the corresponding reference doc for that .java file ...

automatically generates HTML document pages from .java source code and comments;

col. 10, lines 16-59).

As to claim 2:

Minard teaches said graphical user interface includes tabs permitting access to said

form content *(e.g., a tab set at the bottom of the Content pane ... displays the detailed*

content of the file selected in the Navigation pane; col. 10, lines 1-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 9-11 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Minard in view of **Cason** (US 6886134, filed 09/2000).

<u>**As to claim 9:**</u>

Minard teaches a system for displaying forms and HTML content *[col. 9, line 63 -*

col.10, line 15] comprising:

- a display displaying a graphical user interface having at least one window *(e.g.,*

     The interface includes a single Application Browser or "AppBrowser"; see

     Abstract);

- a processor running a browser program and outputting information to said display *[e.g., the client 210 executes a "compiled" (i.e., bytecode or pseudo-compiled) Java program 240, which has been created by compiling a Java source code program or script 205 with a Java compiler 230 ... The AppBrowser lets the user explore, edit, design, and debug all in one unified window ... the AppBrowser presents the documents (or other objects) for manipulation in a window; col. 3, lines 31-41]*;

wherein said processor receives form content from a Java applet *(e.g., a Java file ...the source code for the file is displayed)* and HTML content *(e.g., the Content pane are HTML)* from said Java applet *[col.9, line 63-col. 10, line 15]*;

wherein said HTML content is rendered and controlled by said Java applet and rendered inside a Java execution in the at least one window; and wherein said Java applet provides browsing capabilities to a user based on user interaction *(e.g., if the user selects an HTML file in the Navigation pane ... the user see the rendered HTML file ... in a web browser ... if the user selects the Doc tab when viewing a .java file, the system will the display the corresponding reference doc for that .java file ... automatically generates HTML document pages from .java source code and comments; col. 10, lines 16-59).*

Minard does not explicitly teach *"combines said form content and the HTML content in*

a browser program; and outputs the combined content to the display."

Cason teaches combines said form content and the HTML content in a browser

program; and outputs the combined content to the display *(e.g., combine HTML and*

Java script web presentation ... builds web page dynamically, writing out the Java

script and HTML to present the page on a Web browser, such as Web browser; col. 21,

lines 36-51).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify Minard with Cason because it would have allowed the

user to explore, edit, design, and debug all in one unified window.

As to claim 10:

Minard teaches the Java applet presents the form content in a window *(e.g. , AppBrowser*

400 presents the documents... AppBrowser represent by a tab in a tab set at left lower

left; col.8, lines 1-62).

As to claim 11:

Minard teaches the Java applet includes handling of activation of a back button *(e.g.,*

using Home, Previous, and Next buttons ... travel backward ... used in the Navigation

pane implement standard interface; col. 9, lines 3-62).

As to claim 16:

Minard teaches the processor outputs the HTML content and the form content to be

displayed in a Java applet execution related to the Java applet *(e.g., if the user selects an*

HTML file in the Navigation pane ... the user see the rendered HTML file ... in a web

browser ... if the user selects the Doc tab when viewing a .java file, the system will the

display the corresponding reference doc for that .java file ... automatically generates

HTML document pages from .java source code and comments; col. 10, lines 16-59).

7.   Claims 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Minard** in

view of **Cason,** and further in view of **Maddalozzo et al.** (US 6633316, filed

05/13/1999).

As to claim 12:

The rejection of claim 9 above is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, claim 12 recites information downloaded from the Internet.

The combination of Minard with Cason does not explicitly *teach information downloaded from the Internet.*

Maddalozzo teaches information downloaded from the Internet *(e.g., an application or applet loaded from the web page; col. 10, lines 27-43).*

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Maddalozzo with Minard as modified by Cason because it would have provide the capability for dramatically increasing the speed of operation of a navigation frame of a GUI.

As to claim 13:

Refer to the rejection of claim 12 above. Minard further teaches the Java applet generates tabs for the Java execution, wherein the Java execution further comprises: the tabs, wherein each tab hosts a separate form of one of the Java execution *(see Abstract, col.8, lines 1-62, col.10, lines 16-67, and col. 12, lines 6-13).*

As to claim 14:

Minard teaches processor receives navigation commands from a user *(col. 6, line 37-col.8, line 51)* said processor adding a current page to a history stack in said browser, hiding said Java execution, and rendering said additional HTML content *(col.7, line 1-col.9, line 12)*.

The combination of Minard and Cason does not explicitly teach *downloads additional HTML content from the Internet.*

Maddalozzo teaches downloads additional HTML content from the Internet *(col. 10, lines 27- col.11, line 13)*.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Maddalozzo with Minard as modified by Cason because it would have provide the capability for dramatically increasing the speed of operation of a navigation frame of a GUI.

As to claim 15:

Minard teaches the processor receives navigation commands from a user and executes at least one additional Java applet, said processor adding a current execution to a history stack in said browser, adding an additional tab to said Java execution, and rendering a

new Java execution related to said at least one additional Java applet under said

additional tab *(see Abstract, col. 3, lines 20-41, col.7, line 1-col. 8, line 62, and col.9,*

line 64-col.10, line 59).

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2 and 9-16 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5.   The prior art made of record, see PTO 892, and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure. Applicant should review these references carefully before

responding to this office action.

Contact information

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-

4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30

pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached at (571) 272-4137.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be

obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:
Commissioner for patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

MN

WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER